

submitted that claims 10-13 should also have been indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claims 1, 6, 30 and 32, from which claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 31 and 33 depend, those claims recite, "a resistance value from an output end of the voltage source to a drive end of the light emitting element is smaller than an internal resistance value of the light emitting element" or an equivalent.

The Office Action recites that "Sakuragi (US6,799,357) discloses ... [that] a resistance value from an output end of the voltage source [5] to a drive end of the light emitting element [D1, D2] is smaller than an internal resistance value of the light emitting element" (see page 2, the last paragraph of the Office Action). However, because an operational amplifier 4 is interposed between the voltage source 5 and the light emitting element D1, D2, it is impossible to define the resistance value from the output end of the voltage source 5 to the drive end of the light emitting element D1, D2; or said resistance value is infinite. Therefore, in either case (unable to define or infinite), said resistance value of Sakuragi is **NOT** smaller than the internal resistance value of the light emitting element.

Claims 1, 6, 30 and 32 also recite, "a current flowing into the voltage source is smaller than a current flowing into the light emitting element" or the equivalent.

The Office Action recites that "Sakuragi discloses ... [that] a current flowing into the voltage source [5] is smaller than a current flowing into the light emitting element [D1, D2] (see page 3, first paragraph of the Office Action). However, because the input impedance of the operational amplifier 4 is infinite, it is impossible in principle that current flows into the voltage source 5.

Further regarding claim 2, the claim recites that, "the voltage source has a negative feedback loop that negatively feeds back an output". Applicant respectfully asserts that Sakuragi does not disclose a voltage source with a negative feedback loop.

The Office Action recites that "Sakuragi discloses a voltage source [5] has a negative feedback loop" (see page 3, second paragraph of the Office Action). However, the voltage source 5 does not have a feedback loop. In contrast to Sakuragi, Fig. 1 of this application shows one example of the voltage source having the negative feedback loop. Specifically, the voltage source (OPn) has the negative feedback loop (see Fig. 1).

Claim 14, from which claims 15-27 and 29 depend, recites, "a current driving section for driving the light emitting element with a current".

The Office Action recites that "the Sakuragi discloses a voltage driving section [5] for driving the light emitting element [D1, D2] with voltage" (see page 4, second paragraph of the Office Action). However, the Office Action does not mention explicitly which element of Sakuragi corresponds to a current driving section recited in claim 14. MPEP §2131 recites that "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

If a transistor M2 of Sakuragi corresponded to the current driving section, there would be no voltage driving section in that case. In contrast to Sakuragi, this application describes one example where both the voltage driving section and the current driving section are present (see ch 36 in Fig. 15 of this application).

Further regarding claim 16, the claim recites that, "the switching section simultaneously selects the current drive by the current driving section when being changed to the voltage drive by the voltage driving section to supply". That is, according to the invention recited in claim 16, the switching section is able to simultaneously select the voltage drive by

the voltage driving section and the current drive by the current driving section. This is different from a case where one of the voltage drive and the current drive is selected.

Sakuragi's circuit is not in such states, (a) when Sakuragi selects the voltage drive; (b) when Sakuragi selects the current drive; and (c) when Sakuragi selects the voltage drive and the current drive simultaneously.

Further regarding claims 6-8, Ema fails to overcome the deficiencies in Sakuragi specified above.


For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

In the rejections detailed in the Office Action, and in the response to the Applicant's arguments on pages 18-19, the Office Action repeatedly makes representations regarding the applied references without specifically pointing out the disclosure in the references upon which the Office Action relies for a given claimed element. Should any of the rejections be maintained, or should any new rejections be entered, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office Action specify in detail the disclosure of the applied reference being relied upon with respect to each aspect of each rejected claim.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-33 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen P. Catlin
Registration No. 36,101

JAO:SPC/sqb

Date: November 15, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--